

**REMARKS:**

Previously withdrawn claims 12-31 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1-11 and 32 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-11 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fahey (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,476).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1 (as well as claims 2-10, which depend from claim 1), Fahey does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the transaction module operable to:

- Receive a part identifier and the identity of a supplier to be used to supply each identified part;
- Generate one or more transaction documents each including a request that a supplier provide one or more parts; and
- Communicate the one or more transaction documents to the associated suppliers.

The Office Action does not include any explanation as to how Fahey is alleged to include all of these limitations of claim 1. The Office Action does allege that Fahey discloses transaction documents at step 214, but this allegation is respectfully traversed. Step 214 is one step in the process illustrated in Figure 5 of Fahey for assigning operating costs to various products in a large enterprise that manufactures many different products. Step 214 is merely a step for generating summary reports that include information about the operating costs associated with respective product families. The step 214 fails to teach transaction documents that include a request that a supplier provide one or more parts, and step 214 falls far short of teaching the transaction module as claimed in claim 1.

With respect to claim 32, this claim recites limitations similar to at least some of those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, the discussion above in connection with claim 1 applies equally to claim 32.

With respect to the Official Notice taken in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully request clarification as to the extent of the subject matter for which official notice is being taken as being common knowledge in the art.

Further, Applicant hereby traverses the Official Notice because the asserted facts, as best understood, are not supported by documentary evidence and appear to be the Examiner's opinions formulated using the present application as a template, which constitutes impermissible use of hindsight.

"Official Notice without documentary evidence to support an examiner's conclusion is permissible only in some circumstances. While 'official notice' may be relied upon, these circumstances should be rare when an application is under final rejection or action under 37 C.F.R. 1.113. Official notice unsupported by documentary evidence should only be taken by the examiner where the facts asserted to be well-known, or to be common knowledge in the art are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. As noted by the court in *In re Ahlert*, 424 F.2d 1088, 1091, 165 USPQ 418, 420 (CCPA 1970), the notice of facts beyond the record which may be taken by the examiner must be 'capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy the dispute' (citing *In re Knapp Monarch Co.*, 296 F.2d 230, 132 U.S.P.Q. 6 (C.C.P.A. 1961))." MPEP § 2144.03(A) (emphasis in original).

"It would not be appropriate for the examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known." MPEP § 2144.03(A) (emphasis in original).

The Office Action provides no documentary evidence to support the Official Notice taken by the Examiner, yet the asserted facts are not capable of "instant and unquestionable" demonstration as being well-known. Thus, if the Examiner continues to

maintain the rejection of claims 1-11 and 32 based on the Official Notice, the Applicant requests that the Examiner provide documentary evidence as stated in Section 2144.03 of the M.P.E.P. Further, if the Examiner is relying on personal knowledge to support the finding of what is known in the art, Applicant requests that the Examiner provide an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the finding. (See MPEP § 2144.03(C)).

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1-11 and 32 cannot be rendered obvious by the proposed combination of Fahey and Official Notice. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 and 32 are in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

**The Legal Standard for Obviousness Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:**

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); M.P.E.P. § 2142. Moreover, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

With respect to alleged obviousness, there must be something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In fact, the absence of a suggestion to combine is dispositive in an obviousness determination. *Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.*, 110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The mere fact that

the prior art can be combined or modified does not make the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990); M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. The consistent criterion for determining obviousness is whether the prior art would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art that the process should be carried out and would have a reasonable likelihood of success, viewed in the light of the prior art. Both the suggestion and the expectation of success must be founded in the prior art, not in the Applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991; *In re O'Farrell*, 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988); M.P.E.P. § 2142.

A recent Federal Circuit case makes it clear that, in an obviousness situation, the prior art must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, and that any motivation to combine or modify the prior art must be based upon a suggestion in the prior art. *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Conclusory statements regarding common knowledge and common sense are insufficient to support a finding of obviousness. *Id.* at 1434-35.

**CONCLUSION:**


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

The undersigned hereby authorizes the Director to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayments, to **Deposit Account No. 500777**. If an extension of time is necessary for allowing the Amendment to be timely filed, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) to the extent necessary. Any fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time should be charged to **Deposit Account No. 500777**.

**Please link this application to Customer No. 53184 so that its status may be checked via the PAIR System.**

Respectfully submitted,

29 JUNE 2005  
Date

  
James E. Walton, Registration No. 47,245  
Daren C. Davis, Registration No. 38,425  
Brian E. Harris, Registration No. 48,383  
Michael Alford, Registration No. 48,707  
Law Offices of James E. Walton, P.L.L.C.  
1169 N. Burleson Blvd., Suite 107-328  
Burleson, Texas 76028  
(817) 447-9955 (voice)  
(817) 447-9954 (facsimile)  
jim@waltonpllc.com (e-mail)

**CUSTOMER NO. 53184**  
**ATTORNEYS AND AGENTS FOR APPLICANT**